arXiv:1409.8200v4 [astro-ph.HE] 25 Jul 2016

Implications of the Co-rotation Theorem on the MRI in Axial Symmetry

G. Montani[1]
ENEA, FSN-FUSPHY-TSM, R.C. Frascati, Via E. Fermi 45, 00044 Frascati, Italy
giovanni.montani@frascati.enea.it
and

F. Cianfrani
Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław, Pl. Maksa Borna 9, Pl–50-204 Wrocław, Poland
and

D. Pugliese
Institute of Physics and Research Centre of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Faculty of Philosophy & Science, Silesian University in Opava, Bezručovo náměstí 13, CZ-74601 Opava, Czech Republic

ABSTRACT

We analyze the linear stability of an axially symmetric ideal plasma disk, embedded in a magnetic field and endowed with a differential rotation. This study is performed by adopting the magnetic flux function as the fundamental dynamical variable, in order to outline the role played by the co-rotation theorem on the linear mode structure. Using some specific assumptions (e.g. plasma incompressibility and propagation of the perturbations along the background magnetic field), we select the Alfvenic nature of the Magneto-Rotational Instability and, in the geometric optics limit, we determine the dispersion relation describing the linear spectrum. We show how the implementation of the co-rotation theorem (valid for the background configuration) on the linear dynamics produces the cancellation of the vertical derivative of the disk angular velocity (we check such a feature also in the standard vector formalism to facilitate comparison with previous literature, both in the axisymmetric and three-dimensional case). As a result, we clarify that the unstable modes have, for a stratified disk, the same morphology, proper of a thin disk profile, and the z-dependence has a simple parametric role.

Subject headings: accretion, accretion disks; plasmas; magnetohydrodynamics (MHD)

1. Introduction

In the study of stellar accretion disks (Bisnovatyi-Kogan & Lovelace 2001), as well as in the general problem of the accretion profile around compact astrophysical sources (Abramowicz & Fragile 2013), the question concerning the stability of the rotating plasma is central in the understanding of the angular momentum transport. The rotation of the accretion system is ensured by the gravitational field of the astrophysical source and it is not too far from the Keplerian value, at least for thin disk configurations (Ogilvie 1997). Another basic aspect of the accreting structures consists of their axial symmetry, which can reduce their equilibrium and the associated linear perturbation scheme to a pure two-dimensional problem. However, a rotating fluid, having a

[1]Physics Department, "Sapienza" University of Rome, P.le Aldo Moro 5, 00185 (Roma), Italy

nearly Keplerian differential rotation profile, is clearly stable under perturbations which preserve its axial symmetry (Rayleigh & Hawley 1917; Balbus & Hawley 1998). This issue, still recently debated (Paoletti & Lathrop 2011; Balbus 2011), is of crucial relevance in the set up of the original Shakura idea for accretion (Shakura 1973; Shakura & Sunyaev 1973), based on the angular momentum transport across the disk by means of shear viscosity, associated with the differential rotation. In fact, the requested value of the viscosity coefficient, to account for the observed accretion rates, especially in highly compact stars, like X-ray Pulsars, is not justified by the kinetic predictions in the typical range of density and temperature available for such sources. The instability of the plasma profile is then necessary to account for the onset and the full establishment of a turbulent regime; it can be easily restated as a laminar motion in the presence of an effective viscosity, generated via the non-zero correlation functions of the turbulent fluid velocity field components, see (Balbus 2003) and also (Montani & Carlevaro 2012; Montani & Petitta 2013). As well known, the solution to the puzzle of a stable rotating quasi-Keplerian plasma has been provided by including the presence of a weak magnetic field, always present in astrophysical accreting systems, which is able to trigger within the axial picture, a continuum of unstable Alfvenic modes, known as the Magneto-rotational instability (MRI) (Velikhov 1959; Chandrasekhar 1960). It can be shown that MRI is able to generate a turbulent flow and a satisfactory effective shear viscosity amount (Balbus & Hawley 1991, 1998; Balbus 2003). A discussion of the MRI in the case of a stratified axially symmetric plasma disk can be found in (Balbus 1995) (and also Urpin & Rüdiger (2005)), where it is shown how the unstable modes are triggered by the gradient profile of the angular velocity, differently from the non-magnetized configuration, for which the stability criterion relies on the specific angular momentum Rayleigh & Hawley (1917). In this study perturbations of the steady state are considered adiabatic, accordingly to the local and Boussinesq approximation. The system of equations for the linear evolution is closed by using the entropy equation, in which the perturbed pressure can be negligible, as in a typical problem of the so-called internal waves, when the restoring force, acting on the small disturbances, is mainly due to the gravitational field of the central object.

In the present analysis, we address the same problem, but focusing our attention on the specific Alfvenic character of the MRI and, as the main feature of the considered approach, we investigate the implication that the validity of the co-rotation theorem (Ferraro 1937) (the background disk angular frequency must be a function of the magnetic flux function) has on the linear mode spectrum (see also (Montani & Pugliese 2013)). In particular, we consider a real incompressible plasma in the disk (hypothesis corresponding to a polytropic index approaching infinity in the equation of state) and we restrict the study to the perturbations propagating along the magnetic field only. We first face the analysis of the perturbed linear dynamics, by using a formalism in which the magnetic flux function is a basic dynamical variable and the dispersion relation is calculated in the geometrical optic limit (at all equivalent to the local approach adopted in (Balbus 1995)). Then, in order to shed light on the basic novelty, introduced by the co-rotation theorem, we repeat the same linear perturbation scheme in the usual scenario, relying on the use of the magnetic vector components as in (Balbus 1995). We stress how, in this paper, we consider a pure poloidal background magnetic field, but we then discuss how the role of the azimuthal background magnetic field does not change this picture.

In such vector formulation, the co-rotation condition stands as the orthogonality relation between the background magnetic field and the corresponding gradient of the disk angular velocity.

The main issue of our study consists in demonstrating how the implementation of the co-rotation condition, on the linear perturbation dynamics, leads to the cancellation of the vertical derivative of the angular frequency from the dispersion relation. As a direct consequence the linear mode spectrum retains the same form for a thin disk configuration (where the z-dependence does not enter the disk profile). This result implies that the vertical profile of the disk affects only in a parametric way the stability properties of the steady axisymmetric configuration. Thus, we are lead to attribute more relevance to other instability mechanism, see for instance (Coppi 2008) and

(Urpin & Rüdiger 2005), when the vertical gradients are so marked to affect the disk steady configuration. Finally, in order to deepen the coupling between the constant poloidal background magnetic field and the perturbation profile we consider non-axisymmetric disturbances, according to the vector formalism. We show how the stability condition is affected by the toroidal wave number and MRI results suppressed when the latter is sufficiently large compared to the modulus of the poloidal wave vector.

More specifically in Sec. (2), we provide the basic formalism at the ground of our analysis, by specifying all the dynamical equations characterizing the ideal MHD scenario. In Sec. (3), we define the general properties of the steady background configuration and then we construct the linear perturbation scheme, determining the evolution of small disturbances affecting the background profile. In Sec. (4), we address the geometric optic limit to extract from the linear dynamics the dispersion relation governing the mode spectrum and we discuss the obtained issue. In Sec. (5), the calculation of the normal modes is repeated in the standard scheme, relying on the use of the poloidal magnetic field component, instead of the magnetic flux function, here considered. In Sec. (6), we analyze the non-axisymmetric case in the presence of a constant toroidal background magnetic field component, as allowed by the co-rotation profile. The dispersion relation is derived according to the vector formulation of the previous section and its implications are commented. Concluding remarks follow.

2. Basic Equations

Let us consider the system made of the Faraday law and of the electron force balance

$$\partial_t \vec{B} = -c\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{E} \tag{1}$$

$$\vec{E} + \frac{\vec{v}}{c} \wedge \vec{B} = 0\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ denote the electric and the magnetic fields respectively. Equation (1) admits the solution

$$\vec{E} = -\vec{\nabla}\Phi - \frac{1}{c}\partial_t \vec{A}\,, \tag{3}$$

where $\vec{A}$ is the vector potential, such that the magnetic field $\vec{B} = \vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{A}$, while Φ denotes the time dependent electric potential with $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A} = 0$ (Coulomb gauge). Using this solution in (2), we obtain

$$\vec{\nabla}\Phi + \frac{1}{c}\partial_t \vec{A} = \frac{\vec{v}}{c} \wedge \vec{B}\,. \tag{4}$$

In what follows, we consider a two-dimensional axisymmetric system, labeled by cylindrical coordinates $\{r, \phi, z\}$; all the functions involved are independent of the azimuthal angle ϕ. Without loss of generality, we now express the magnetic field in the form

$$\vec{B} = -\frac{1}{r}\partial_z \psi \vec{e}_r + \frac{\bar{B}_\phi}{r}\vec{e}_\phi + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r \psi \vec{e}_z\,, \tag{5}$$

or equivalently, we take the vector potential

$$\vec{A} = \vec{A}_p + \frac{\psi}{r}\vec{e}_\phi\,, \tag{6}$$

where, in the Coulomb gauge, the poloidal component $\vec{A}_p$ satisfies the two conditions

$$\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{A}_p = \frac{\bar{B}_\phi}{r}\vec{e}_\phi \quad ; \quad \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A}_p = 0\,. \tag{7}$$

We also consider the following general velocity field in the plasma

$$\vec{v} = \vec{v}_p + \omega r \vec{e}_\phi\,, \tag{8}$$

where $\vec{v}_p = v_r \vec{e}_r + v_z \vec{e}_z$ denotes the poloidal velocity field. Separating the azimuthal and the poloidal components of the Eq. (4) we obtain

$$\partial_t \psi + \vec{v}_p \cdot \vec{\nabla}\psi = 0 \tag{9}$$

$$\vec{\nabla}\Phi + \frac{1}{c}\partial_t \vec{A}_p = \frac{\omega}{c}\vec{\nabla}\psi + \frac{1}{c}\vec{v}_p \wedge (\vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{A}_p)\,. \tag{10}$$

We rewrite this system as two scalar equations, by taking the curl of Eq. (10) (having the azimuthal component only), together with (9) we consider the equation

$$\partial_t \bar{B}_\phi + \vec{v}_p \cdot \vec{\nabla}\bar{B}_\phi + \bar{B}_\phi \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v}_p - 2\frac{\bar{B}_\phi v_r}{r} = r(\partial_z \omega \partial_r \psi - \partial_r \omega \partial_z \psi). \tag{11}$$

It is worth stressing that Eq. (9) is a gauge invariant relation, being the azimuthal component of the (physical) electron force balance equation. The azimuthal component of the ideal MHD momentum conservation provides the following equation for the angular velocity

$$\rho r\left(\partial_t \omega + \vec{v}_p \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega\right) + 2\rho v_r \omega = \frac{1}{4\pi r^2}\left(\partial_r \psi \partial_z \bar{B}_\phi - \partial_z \psi \partial_r \bar{B}_\phi\right)\,, \tag{12}$$

where ρ is the mass density of the plasma profile. The poloidal component of the momentum conservation equation takes the form

$$\rho\left(\partial_t\vec{v}_p+\vec{v}_p\cdot\vec{\nabla}\vec{v}_p-\omega^2 r\vec{e}_r\right)=-\vec{\nabla}p- -\frac{1}{4\pi r}\left[\partial_r\left(\frac{1}{r}\partial_r\psi\right)+\frac{1}{r}\partial_z^2\psi\right]\vec{\nabla}\psi- -\frac{1}{8\pi r^2}\vec{\nabla}\bar{B}_\phi^2+\vec{F}_p^e\,, \quad (13)$$

where p denotes the pressure and by $\vec{F}_p^e$ we indicate the external forces acting on the plasma configuration, which is retained non-zero in the meridian plane only. We complete this scheme by the continuity equation, describing the mass conservation via the behavior of the mass density ρ

$$\partial_t\rho+\vec{\nabla}\cdot(\rho\vec{v}_p)=0. \quad (14)$$

The structure of this system of equations, characterizing the axisymmetric plasma evolution, (9)-(12), allows to fix some important points. i)-From Eq. (11), it is immediate to recognize that if the azimuthal magnetic field vanishes, then we must have $\omega=\omega(\psi)$. ii)-Eqs. (11) and (12) show how the angular velocity ω and the azimuthal magnetic field $\bar{B}_\phi$ have a strict correlation, since they are able to generate each other. In fact, if one of these two quantities is constant or a function of ψ, the other one has a vanishing right-hand-side in its dynamical equation: we then get linear homogeneous equations in normal form, having the null solution as the unique one, in correspondence to a vanishing initial value. Thus, if the right-hand-side of Eqs. (11) and (12) vanishes, the variable $\bar{B}_\phi$ and ω respectively can not be generated from the dynamics if they vanish in the beginning.

3. Linear perturbation theory

We now develop a linear perturbation approach around a background configuration, corresponding to a purely rotating plasma disk, embedded in a vacuum poloidal magnetic field[1]. Here we denote by a suffix (0) all the background quantities and by the suffix (1) all the corresponding linear fluctuations. The main assumption we adopt in our analysis is the Alfvenic nature of the perturbation i.e. $\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{v}_{p1}=0$ (an Alfvenic mode does not transport matter). As effect of the plasma backreaction, the magnetic surface function admits the following natural decomposition $\psi=\psi_0+\psi_1$, with $\mid\psi_1\mid\ll\mid\psi_0\mid$. In the case of a purely rotating background configuration, Eq. (12) is automatically verified at the zero order, while the poloidal system (13) naturally splits in two background equations[2]

$$\vec{\nabla}p_0=\rho_0\left(\omega_0^2(\psi_0)r\vec{e}_r-\omega_K^2(r,z^2)\vec{r}_p\right) \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{1}{4\pi r}\left[\partial_r\left(\frac{1}{r}\partial_r\psi_0\right)+\frac{1}{r}\partial_z^2\psi_0\right]=0\,. \quad (16)$$

The first of these equations is the gravostatic equilibrium determining the disk morphology, while the second one is the force-free condition for the vacuum magnetic field of the central object. Since for the static axisymmetric background the corotation theorem holds, we take the angular velocity in the form $\omega=\bar{\omega}(\psi)+\omega^+$, i.e. we separate a contribution depending on the function ψ at any order from a generic angular velocity term. Clearly, we have $\omega_0^+=0$ and

$$\omega_1=\frac{d\omega}{d\psi}\mid_{\psi=\psi_0}\psi_1+\omega_1^+\equiv\bar{\omega}_1+\omega_1^+,\ \bar{\omega}_1\equiv\dot{\omega}_0(\psi_0)\psi_1. \quad (17)$$

In order to address the perturbation scheme, we introduce the poloidal plasma shift $\vec{\xi}_p$, defined via the relation $\vec{v}_{1p}\equiv\partial_t\vec{\xi}_p$. Perturbing Eq. (9), we get the basic relation

$$\partial_t\psi_1+\vec{v}_{1p}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\psi_0=0\ \rightarrow\psi_1=-\vec{\xi}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\psi_0\,. \quad (18)$$

Eq. (17) allows, together with (18), to write the perturbed azimuthal momentum conservation (12) in the form

$$r\partial_t\omega_1^+=-2\omega_0 v_{1pr}+\frac{1}{4\pi r^2\rho_0}\left(\partial_z(\bar{B}_\phi)_1\partial_r\psi_0-\partial_r(\bar{B}_\phi)_1\partial_z\psi_0\right). \quad (19)$$

It is worth stressing that Eq. (18) permits to cancel out the contribution of $\bar{\omega}_1$, simply because its variation is induced by the perturbation ψ_1 (actually, we used above the relation $\vec{\nabla}\omega_0=\dot{\omega}_0\vec{\nabla}\psi_0$). The first order structure of Eq. (11) takes the simple form (the contribution due to $\bar{\omega}_1$ cancels

[1] The magnetic field of a compact star is typically well-modeled by a dipolar configuration Meszaros (1992).

[2] Indeed the external force coincides with the star gravity, i.e. $\vec{F}_0^e=-\omega_K^2(r,z^2)\vec{r}_p$, $\vec{r}_p=(r,z)$, $\omega_K^2=GM_s/(r^2+z^2)^{3/2}$, being the Keplerian angular frequency (here G denotes the Newton's constant and M_s the mass of the central body).

out)

$$\partial_t(\bar{B}_\phi)_1 = r\left(\partial_z\omega_1^+\partial_r\psi_0 - \partial_r\omega_1^+\partial_z\psi_0\right) . \quad (20)$$

Observing that in the linear perturbation regime, the induced poloidal magnetic field remains much smaller than the background component, i.e. $\mid \vec{\nabla}\psi_1 \mid \ll \mid \vec{\nabla}\psi_0 \mid$, the radial and vertical equations take, at the first order, the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho_0\left[\partial_t^2\xi_r - 2\omega_0 r\left(\dot{\omega}_0\psi_1 + \omega_1^+\right)\right] = \\
&= \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0}\partial_r p_0 - \partial_r p_1 - \frac{1}{4\pi r}\Delta\psi_1\partial_r\psi_0 \\
&\rho_0\partial_t^2\xi_z = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0}\partial_z p_0 - \partial_z p_1 - \frac{1}{4\pi r}\Delta\psi_1\partial_z\psi_0,
\end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where we introduced the notation

$$\Delta\psi_1 \equiv \partial_r\left(\frac{1}{r}\partial_r\psi_1\right) + \frac{1}{r}\partial_z^2\psi_1 . \quad (22)$$

Finally, since we requested the incompressibility of the plasma, from the perturbed mass conservation Eq. (14), by time integration, we have

$$\rho_1 = -\vec{\xi_p}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\rho_0 . \quad (23)$$

The behavior of the perturbed pressure p_1 will be deduced via the preservation of the incompressibility along the evolution (see below). Taking the second time derivative of ψ_1 from Eq. (18), using Eqs. (21) to express the corresponding second time derivative of the shift vector components, we get the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^2\psi_1 + 2\omega_0 r\partial_r\omega_0\psi_1 + 2\omega_0 r\partial_r\psi_0\omega_1^+ = \\
\frac{1}{\rho_0}\vec{\nabla}\psi_0\cdot\vec{\nabla}p_1 + v_A^2 r\Delta\psi_1 ,
\end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $v_A^2 = v_{Ar}^2 + v_{Az}^2$ is the square of the background Alfven speed, with

$$v_{Ar}^2 = \frac{\left(\partial_z\psi_0\right)^2}{4\pi r^2\rho_0}, \quad v_{Az}^2 = \frac{\left(\partial_r\psi_0\right)^2}{4\pi r^2\rho_0} . \quad (25)$$

Eq. (24), together with (18), (19) and (23), constitute the system of perturbed equations, able to provide the dispersion relation for the corresponding spectrum of modes.

4. Geometric optic limit

In what follows, we shall address the geometric optic limit for the perturbed quantities $(...)_1$, which are taken in the form

$$(...)_1(t,r,z) = (...)^+(t,r,z)\exp\{i\Theta(t,r,z)\} , \quad (26)$$

where $(...)^+$ is a small and regular (smooth like the background) amplitude, while the function Θ is a very large phase (since it varies of 2π on the small perturbation wavelength). Therefore, we will naturally introduce the definitions $\vec{k} \equiv \vec{\nabla}\Theta$, $\Omega \equiv -\partial_t\Theta$ so that, we get the basic relation of the adopted approximation, i.e.

$$\partial_t(...)_1 = -i\Omega(...)_1 , \quad \vec{\nabla}(...)_1 = i\vec{k}(...)_1 . \quad (27)$$

This approach to the perturbation analysis is equivalent to a local approximation (large wavenumber limit), but the request of a linear theory, for which the perturbed magnetic field must be small in comparison to the background one, implies the restriction

$$\mid \vec{k} \mid \mid\psi_1\mid \ll \mid \vec{\nabla}\psi_0 \mid . \quad (28)$$

Indeed, we retained $\vec{\nabla}\psi_0$ in Eq. (18) (otherwise no evolving perturbations would arise), as well as the gradient $\vec{\nabla}\rho_0$ in Eq. (23). Using such approximation scheme, i.e. retaining dominant terms in the wavenumber vector $\vec{k}$ (as well as the inhomogeneous term in the angular velocity, responsible for MRI), Eqs. (21) take the compact form

$$\Omega^2\vec{\xi_p} + 2\omega_0\left(\dot{\omega}_0\psi_1 + \omega_1^+\right)\vec{e}_r = i\vec{k}\frac{p_1}{\rho_0} - \frac{k^2\psi_1}{4\pi r^2\rho_0}\vec{\nabla}\psi_0 . \quad (29)$$

In order to select the Alfenic character of the MRI, we now choose the wavevector $\vec{k}$ along the background field $\vec{B}_0$, so eliminating the magnetic pressure contribution. In our formalism, such a condition reads as $\vec{k}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\psi_0 = 0$ and this simplifies the expression of the perturbed pressure p_1, as calculated from Eq. (29). In fact, taking the scalar product by $\vec{k}$ and implementing the incompressibility condition $\vec{k}\cdot\vec{\xi_p} = 0$, we get

$$k^2 p_1 = -2i\rho_0\omega_0 k_r r\left(\dot{\omega}_0\psi_1 + \omega_1^+\right) . \quad (30)$$

This relation states the preservation of the plasma incompressibility in the linear evolution of the per-

turbations.[3] Analogously, Eq. (24) rewrites

$$\left(\Omega^2 - y_r - \omega_A^2\right)\psi_1 = 2\omega_0 r\partial_r\psi_0\omega_1^+\,, \qquad (31)$$

where $y_r \equiv 2\omega_0 r\partial_r\omega_0$, $\omega_A^2 \equiv k^2 v_A^2$. Eqs. (19) and (20) read as

$$r\Omega\omega_1^+ = -2\omega_0\Omega\xi_r - \frac{\vec{k}\cdot\vec{B}_0}{4\pi\rho_0 r}(\bar{B}_\phi)_1 \qquad (32)$$

$$\Omega(\bar{B}_\phi)_1 = -r^2\vec{k}\cdot\vec{B}_0\omega_1^+\,. \qquad (33)$$

Combining together these last two equations, we easily get

$$r\left(\Omega^2 - \bar{\omega}_A^2\right)\omega_1^+ = -2\omega_0\Omega^2\xi_r\,, \qquad (34)$$

Finally, the first of (21) provides the relation

$$\Omega^2\partial_r\psi_0\xi_r = -\left(\alpha y_r + v_{Az}^2 k^2\right)\psi_1 - 2\alpha\omega_0 r\partial_r\psi_0\omega_1^+\,, \qquad (35)$$

where $\alpha \equiv 1 - k_r^2/k^2$. Using Eq. (35) into the relation (34), we can express the quantity ω_1^+ in terms of ψ_1 and then Eq. (31) yields the dispersion relation

$$\Omega^4 - b\,\Omega^2 + c = 0, \qquad (36)$$
$$b \equiv \left(K_0^2 + 2\omega_A^2\right) + 4\omega_0^2(\alpha - 1) \quad c \equiv \omega_A^2\left(y_r + \omega_A^2\right),$$

where $K_0^2 \equiv y_r + 4\omega_0^2$ is the epicyclic frequency and $\omega_{Ar}^2 \equiv \omega_A^2 - k^2 v_{Az}^2 < \omega_A^2$. It can be proved that at the necessary condition to get MRI is provided by the condition $\omega_A^2 < -y_r$, which ensures $c < 0$ (in fact the position $b < 0$ requires again $c < 0$).

5. Vector formulation

In order to better elucidate how the validity of the co-rotation theorem for the background configuration influences the structure of the dispersion relation, we here analyze the linear perturbation dynamics, using the same vector formulation adopted in Balbus (1995).

We start by writing down the basic evolution equations for the linear corrections in terms of the poloidal magnetic field $\vec{B}_p$ and the toroidal component B_ϕ, as well as by using the perturbed poloidal velocity field $\vec{v}_{1p}$ (absent in the background), instead of the plasma shift. The equations below are determined under the same hypotheses of the previous sections and we also introduce the perturbed toroidal velocity v_{ϕ_1}, without any additional splitting between its co-rotational and generic parts.

The incompressibility condition clearly stands as $\vec{k}\cdot\vec{v}_{1p} = 0$, while the poloidal components of the momentum conservation take the form

$$\Omega\vec{v}_{1p} - 2i\omega_0 v_{\phi_1}\vec{e}_r - \frac{\vec{k}}{\rho_0}p_1 - i\frac{\vec{\nabla}p_0}{\rho_0^2}\rho_1 - \frac{1}{4\pi\rho_0}\left(\vec{B}_0\cdot\vec{B}_1\vec{k} - \vec{k}\cdot\vec{B}_0\vec{B}_1\right) = 0\,, \qquad (37)$$

where $\vec{B}_1$ denotes the perturbed poloidal component of the magnetic field.

The poloidal component of the induction equation correspondingly gives

$$\Omega\vec{B}_1 = -\vec{k}\cdot\vec{B}_0\vec{v}_{1p}\,. \qquad (38)$$

Substituting this relation in Eq. (37) and using the incompressibility constraint (since $\vec{k}$ is parallel to $\vec{B}_0$, then $\vec{B}_0\cdot\vec{v}_{1p} = 0$), we rewrite it as follows

$$\left(\Omega^2 - \omega_A^2\right)\vec{v}_{1p} = 2i\Omega\omega_0\vec{e_r}v_{\phi_1} + \frac{\Omega\vec{k}}{\rho_0}p_1. \qquad (39)$$

Above, we neglected the term containing ρ_1, coherently with the mass conservation equation. Furthermore, preserving the incompressibility condition leads again to determine the perturbed pressure p_1 as in Eq.(30), which substituted back yields

$$\left(\Omega^2 - \omega_A^2\right)\vec{v}_{1p} = 2i\Omega\omega_0 v_{\phi_1}\left(\vec{e}_r - \frac{k_r}{k^2}\vec{k}\right). \qquad (40)$$

Now, the azimuthal components of the momentum conservation equation and the induction one, respectively write

$$\Omega v_{\phi_1} + ir\vec{v}_{1p}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\omega_0 + 2i\omega_0 v_{1pr} + \frac{\vec{k}\cdot\vec{B}_0}{4\pi\rho_0}B_{\phi 1} = 0 \qquad (41)$$

and

$$\Omega B_{\phi 1} - ir\vec{B}_1\cdot\vec{\nabla}\omega_0 + \vec{k}\cdot\vec{B}_0 v_{\phi_1} = 0\,. \qquad (42)$$

[3] If we had evaluated this same condition from Eqs. (21), the gradient $\vec{\nabla}\rho_0$ would have added, via Eq. (23), the term $\Omega^2\rho_1$ in the left-hand-side of Eq. (29). Such a contribution is negligible for an incompressible fluid because of the large value of the sound velocity $c_s^2 \equiv \gamma p_0/\rho_0$, with the polytropic index $\gamma \to \infty$.

Substituting in this last Eq. (42) the expression of $\vec{B}_1$ in terms of $\vec{v}_{1p}$, as provided by Eq. (38), we can easily get the $B_{\phi 1}$, to be inserted into Eq. (41). So doing, we arrive to the following basic relation

$$\left(\Omega^2 - \omega_A^2\right)\left[i\Omega v_{\phi_1} - r\vec{v}_{1p}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\omega_0\right] = 2\Omega^2\omega_0 v_{1pr}\,. \tag{43}$$

We now multiply Eq. (40) by the vector $\vec{\nabla}\omega_0$ and recalling that, under the considered hypotheses, it is $\vec{k}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = 0$, we get the relation

$$\left(\Omega^2 - \omega_A^2\right) r\vec{v}_{1p}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = i\Omega y_r v_{\phi_1}\,. \tag{44}$$

The equation above can be substituting in Eq. (43), yielding

$$\left(\Omega^2 - \omega_A^2 - y_r\right) v_\phi = -2i\Omega\omega_0 v_{1pr}\,. \tag{45}$$

Finally, the radial component of Eq. (40) reads as

$$\left(\Omega^2 - \omega_A^2\right) v_{1pr} = 2i\Omega\omega_0\alpha v_{\phi_1}\,. \tag{46}$$

Combining together Eqs. (45) and (46) we easily recover the dispersion relation of Eq. (36).

Let us now discuss how the present picture can be affected by the presence of a background toroidal magnetic field. Actually, including such a background magnetic field component, in the perturbation scheme, would correspond to modify Eq. (37) only (see also Balbus (1995), where this component is included ab initio), by adding a term of the form $-B_{\phi 0}B_{\phi 1}\vec{k}/4\pi\rho_0$. This contribution is clearly the additional toroidal pressure component, the tension modification vanishes because of the axial symmetry prescription, removing the azimuthal component of the wavevector. However, when we calculate the perturbed pressure from the preservation of the incompressibility along the plasma evolution and then substituting it back into Eq. (37), the additional term naturally cancell out of the poloidal momentum conservation equations. Since that stage, the background poloidal magnetic field component disappears from the perturbation scheme and hence from the dispersion relation (clearly in such a case, the wavevector is parallel to the poloidal magnetic field only).

6. Non-axisymmetric perturbations

In this section, we face the study of non-axisymmetric Alfvenic perturbations, including in the background configuration a non-zero toroidal component of the magnetic field $B_{\phi 0}$, along the scheme traced in section 4. In Balbus & Hawley (1992), the same problem is analyzed in the case $\omega_0 = \omega_0(r)$, outlining how the dynamo mechanism implies a time dependence of $B_{\phi 0}$ and, hence, a time dependence of the perturbation wavenumbers too (see also Goldreich & Lynden-Bell (1965)). However, when the co-rotation condition is preserved for the background (*i.e.* we deal with a stationary, axisymmetric and purely rotating configuration), Eq. (20) clearly admits the only solution $B_{\phi 0} = const.$. Thus, as an important consequence of the co-rotation profile, no dynamo effect takes place and we deal with a stationary background even for a three-dimensional (non-axisymmetric) problem.

Thus, we now consider perturbations, whose plane wave representation is characterized by the term $\exp\{i(\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}_p + m\phi)\}$, where m is an integer number. Then, introducing the notation

$$\vec{\mathcal{B}}_0 \equiv \left(\vec{B}_0\,,\, B_{\phi 0}\right) \quad , \quad \vec{\kappa} \equiv \left(\vec{k}\,,\, \frac{m}{r}\right)$$
$$\bar{\omega}_A^2 \equiv \frac{\left(\vec{\kappa}\cdot\vec{\mathcal{B}}_0\right)^2}{4\pi\rho_0}\,,\; \Omega^* \equiv \Omega + m\omega_0\,. \tag{47}$$

Eqs (39) and (43), once restated for the perturbed velocity vector $\vec{v} = (\vec{v}_p\,,\, v_{\phi 1})$, can be expressed in the following single vector equation (we note that, in the geometric optics limit, we have $m \gg 1$)

$$i\Omega^*\left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2\right)\vec{v}_1 = i\frac{\Omega^{*2}\vec{\kappa}}{\rho_0}\left(p_1 + p_1^{(m)}\right) - 2\Omega^{*2}\omega_0\left(\vec{e}_r v_{\phi 1} - \vec{e}_\phi v_{pr1}\right) + \left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2\right) r\vec{v}_p\cdot\vec{\nabla}\omega_0\vec{e}_\phi\,, \tag{48}$$

where $p_1^{(m)} \equiv \vec{\mathcal{B}}_0\cdot\vec{\mathcal{B}}1/4\pi$ denotes the perturbed magnetic pressure, $\vec{\mathcal{B}}_1 = (\vec{B}_{p1}\,,\, B_{\phi 1})$ being the full perturbed magnetic field.

Since, we are considering an incompressible fluid, *i.e.* $\vec{v}_1\cdot\vec{\kappa} = 0$, the pressure p_1 can be calculated by preserving such a constraint in the

momentum conservation equation above and, then substituted there, so getting

$$i\Omega^* \left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2\right) \vec{v}_1 = -2\Omega^{*2}\omega_0 \left[\left(\vec{e}_r - \frac{k_r}{\kappa^2}\vec{\kappa}\right) v_{\phi 1}\right] + \\ + \left[\left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2\right) r\vec{v}_p \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0 + 2\Omega^{*2}\omega_0 v_{p1r}\right] \left(\vec{e}_\phi - \frac{m}{r\kappa^2}\vec{\kappa}\right) , \quad (49)$$

where $\kappa^2 \equiv k^2 + m^2/r^2$.

Since, we still consider $\vec{\kappa}$ parallel to $\vec{\mathcal{B}}_0$, then we have $\vec{\kappa} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = \vec{k} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = 0$. Hence, Eq. (44) rewrites as

$$\left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2\right) r\vec{v}_p \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = i\Omega^* y_r v_\phi \, . \quad (50)$$

Substituting this relation in the azimuthal component of Eq. (49), we easily reach the following generalization of Eq. (45)

$$\left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2 - \alpha_\phi y_r + 2i\Omega^*\omega_0\beta_{r\phi}\right) v_{\phi 1} = -2i\Omega^*\omega_0\alpha_\phi v_{pr1} \, , \quad (51)$$

where $\alpha_\phi \equiv 1 - m^2/r^2\kappa^2$ and $\beta_{r\phi} \equiv mk_r/r\kappa^2$.

Finally, the radial component of Eq. (49) gives the complementary relation

$$\left(\Omega^{*2} - \bar{\omega}_A^2 - 2i\Omega^*\omega_0\beta_{r\phi}\right) v_{pr1} = \\ = \left(2i\Omega^*\omega_0\alpha - \beta_{r\phi} y_r\right) v_{\phi 1} \, . \quad (52)$$

Now, the dispersion relation takes the form

$$\Omega^{*4} - \tilde{b}\,\Omega^{*2} + \tilde{c} = 0, \quad (53)$$
$$\tilde{b} \equiv 2\bar{\omega}_A^2 + \alpha_\phi y_r + 4\omega_0^2 \frac{k_z^2}{\kappa^2},$$
$$\tilde{c} \equiv \omega_A^2 \left(\alpha_\phi y_r + \omega_A^2\right)$$

The study of the stability is qualitatively the same as for (36), which can be easily recovered for $m \equiv 0$. In particular, the necessary condition to get MRI is now $\omega_A^2 < -\alpha_\phi y_r$, which ensures $c < 0$ ($b < 0$ requires again $c < 0$). Therefore, it is easy to recognize that the non-axisymmetric MRI is suppressed when

$$\frac{m}{r} \gg |\vec{k}_p|, \quad (54)$$

while in the opposite case we recover the stability condition of the previous sections (axisymmetric case).

7. Discussion and Conclusions

We analyzed the morphology that the MRI takes in two-dimensional axial symmetry, when the validity of the co-rotation theorem for the background configuration of a stratified differentially rotating disk is taken into account. We studied an incompressible plasma, subjected to the further restrictions (non affecting the Alfvenic nature of the MRI) that the background azimuthal magnetic field vanishes identically and the perturbations propagate along the background poloidal magnetic field. The dispersion relation for the normal modes is derived in the geometrical optic limit and it turns out to be isomorphic to that one of a thin disk configuration.

By other words, also in the case of a stratified disk the relevant quantity in triggering the MRI is the radial gradient of the disk angular velocity, while the vertical profile of the background configuration does not enter the unstable mode spectrum, apart from a parametric dependence of all the quantities involved in the problem.

It is worth noting that, with respect to the analysis developed in Balbus (1995), we do not address the Boussinesq approximation and do not use the entropy evolution equation. Nonetheless, the behavior of the perturbed mass density is negligible in both the approaches and therefore they clearly overlap (indeed, for an incompressible plasma, the polytropic index approaches infinity and the entropy equation for the perturbations essentially reduces to the mass conservation law). The reason for a net discrepancy in the two studies of the stratified disk stability, according to the ideal MHD representation, is in our accounting for the co-rotation theorem. Indeed, when the wave vector is parallel to the background poloidal magnetic field, the momentum conservation equations must preserve the spatial constraint $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\psi_0 = 0$ (in the vector form it reads $\vec{B}_0 \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = 0$), whose existence affects the dispersion relation. Clearly, the morphology of the background has a direct impact on the nature and the propagation of the linear disturbances. The direct dependence of the background angular velocity on the magnetic flux surfaces represents a well-defined link between the magnetic configuration and the differential rotation of the stratified disk, having the key implication to cancel the vertical derivative of the disk

angular frequency in the dispersion relation.

Finally, we observe, how in the limit of a thin disk configuration, the co-rotation theorem does not affect the MRI profile and, actually, we obtain the well-know standard result (seeBalbus & Hawley (1998), Balbus & Hawley (1991)). This is because the condition $\vec{B}_0 \cdot \vec{\nabla}\omega_0 = 0$ is identically satisfied: for a thin disk we have $B_{r0} \sim 0$ (the profile for a compact star is typically dipole-like) and $\omega_0 = \omega_0(r)$ (the vertical dependence can be properly averaged out).

For the sake of completeness in Sec.6 we discuss also non-axisymmetric perturbations, compatible with a co-rotation profile. In fact, as far as $\omega = \omega(\psi)$ only a constant poloidal magnetic field is permitted. We show how the dispersion relation implies MRI suppression as soon as the poloidal wave vector components is sufficiently large, *i.e.* much greater than the poloidal component. This fact has intriguing implications on the disk morphology since the validity of such a condition depends on the ratio m/r and therefore it is better fulfilled in the inner disk regions.

Although, the present analysis aims to outline the implications of the co-rotation theorem on the MRI morphology, according to a stationary and axisymmetric background (corresponding to the same assumptions at the ground of Balbus (1995)), it is worth addressing the question concerning if a **real** disk fulfills such conditions. The problem is, in principle complicated, depending on the specific accretion process, i.e. accretion of the compact object from a surrounding nebula, a companion binary star, etc., but a simple theoretical consideration can shed light on the reliability of the presented scenario. The first point to be focused is that the validity of the present analysis requires that the considered assumptions, i.e. the predictivity of the co-rotation theorem, are valid for a time scale much greater than the growth time of the MRI, namely ω_0^{-1}.

Actually, the validity of the co-rotation theorem, apart from the axial symmetry (implicit in the gravitationally confined disk configuration) requires that the system is stationary and the poloidal velocity vanishes, see Eq. (11) Benini et al. (2011).

Let us discuss these two prescriptions if the radial profile is concerned, which indeed is the only relevant contribution for the accretion and, as we have seen above, for the MRI mode spectrum.

To deal with the co-rotation theorem, the radial in-falling velocity must be much smaller than the azimuthal one, i.e. $\mid v_r \mid \ll \omega_0 r$. Such a condition can be refined, by using Eq. (11), which yields

$$\mid v_r \mid \ll \frac{r}{H}\frac{B_p}{B_\phi}\omega_0 r\,, \tag{55}$$

where H is the disk half-depth, while B_p and B_ϕ denote the estimate of the poloidal and azimuthal background field intensity, respectively. As far as B_ϕ does not exceed B_p (we recall that the magnetic field of the central object is dipole-like), we see that $\mid v_r \mid \ll \omega_0 r$ is a more constraining condition.

Furthermore, the stationarity request implies that the radial fluid acceleration be much smaller than the gravitational one, namely $\mid v_r \mid /\tau_{ns} \ll \omega_K^2 r$, where τ_{ns} denotes the typical time scale for the emergence of a system non-stationarity.

The first of these requirements is ensured by the proportionality relation between the radial velocity and the viscosity coefficient of the plasma, i.e. $\mid v_r \mid \propto \eta_v$.

However, before MRI develops, the turbulence in the disk cannot be triggered by powerful linear instabilities and the viscosity coefficient η_v has essentially the very small kinetic value, ensured by the ion-ion collisions(Montani & Petitta 2013). Thus, the assumption of a pure rotating background disk is conceptually well-grounded.

The second requirement must be evaluated in correspondence to the shortest time scale that we can postulate for the non-stationarity, i.e. the MRI growth time, $\tau_{ns} \approx \tau_{MRI} \sim \omega_0^{-1}$. Hence we get: $\mid v_r \mid \ll \omega_K^2 r/\omega_0 = \omega_K r(\omega_K/\omega_0)$. By other words, as far as the disk angular velocity is not much greater than the Keplerian one, the first requirement implies the second too. Actually, in a stratified disk, these two angular velocities can differ from each other, but their ratio cannot violate the proposed scheme, due to the smallness of $\mid v_r \mid$, i.e. due to the weakness of the initial plasma disk viscosity (for a discussion of the allowed values for the above ratio in a thick disk, see Ogilvie (1997)).

It is worth stressing that, the radial velocity remains small in comparison to the azimuthal one even in the viscous α-Shakura disk Shakura

(1973); Bisnovatyi-Kogan & Lovelace (2001), in which context, the MRI must be implemented to account for the continuous trigger of the turbulence. In particular, we note that in a typical viscous time $\tau_v \sim r/ \mid v_r \mid$ (the time in which the accreting material falls from a given r to the central object), the MRI fully develops, since $\omega_0 \tau_v \gg 1$, as a consequence of the first requirement.

Then the validity of the co-rotation theorem, when studying the MRI, is a well-grounded assumption, but when the accretion process is strongly enhanced (for instance in the collapsar profile or in the cataclysmic variables), in which case the stationarity hypothesis can be also clearly questioned.

This work has been developed in the framework of the CGW Collaboration (www.cgwcollaboration.it). DP wishes to thank the Blanceflor Boncompagni-Ludovisi, née Bildt Foundation, for support during the first development of this work, and thanks the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (within the Royal Society fellowship program) for support during 2015, and acknowledges support from the Junior GACR grant of the Czech Science Foundation No:16-03564Y. FC is supported by funds provided by the National Science Center under the agreement DEC-2011/02/A/ST2/00294.

REFERENCES

Bisnovatyi-Kogan G. S. & Lovelace R. V. E. 2001, New Astronomy Review, **45**, 663

Abramowicz M. A. & Fragile P. C. 2013, Living Rev. Rel., **16**, 1

Ogilvie G. I. 1997, MNRAS, **288**, 63

Lord Rayleigh 1917, Proc. R. Soc. **A**, 93, 148-154

Balbus S. A. & Hawley J. F. 1998, Rev. Mod. Phys., **70**, 1

Paoletti M. S. & Lathrop D. P. 2011, Phys. Rev. Lett., **106**, 024501

Balbus S. A. 2011, Nature (London), **470**, 475

Shakura N. I. 1973, Soviet Astronomy, **16**, 756

Shakura N. I. & Sunyaev R. A. 1973, A&A, **24**, 337

Montani G. & Carlevaro N. 2012, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 123004

Montani G. & Petitta J. 2013, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 053111

Velikhov E. P. 1959, Sov. Phys. JETP, **36**, 1398

Chandrasekhar S. 1960, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **46**, 253

Balbus S. A. & Hawley J. F. 1991, ApJ, **376**, 214

Balbus S. A. 2003, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **41**, 555

Balbus S. A. 1995, ApJ, **453**, 380

Urpin V. & Rüdiger G. 2005, A&A, **437**, 23-30

Ferraro V. C. A. 1937, MNRAS, **97**, 458

Meszaros P., *High-Energy Radiation from Magnetized Neutron Stars* (University of Chicago Press, 1992).

Coppi B. 2008, Europhys. Lett. **82**, 19001

Montani G. & Pugliese D. 2013, *Phys. Rev. E* 88, 033101

Balbus S. A. & Hawley J. F. 1992, *Astrophys. J.*, **400**, 610

Goldreich P. & Lynden-Bell D. 1965, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **130**, 125

Benini R., Montani G. & Petitta J. 2011, Europhys. Lett. 96 19002

This 2-column preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.